

As background, in the February 23, 2005 Amendment, solely to advance prosecution for exemplary embodiments of the present invention, Applicants amended claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 13, and 14 to further define the display features of particular exemplary embodiments. Specifically, these claims were amended to recite that the plural display means are plural, separate display means. That is, in the present invention, in exemplary embodiments, more than one physical display/screen may be used. In Murray, however, only one screen is disclosed which may be divided into a plurality of areas.

In this Office Action, in the Response to Arguments, the Examiner states that in this case, the claim recites “a portable information terminal device” with “two separate displays”. The Examiner states that Murray teaches this limitation because “separate display means” which still does not clearly define that there are two separate physical monitors/displays, and the Examiner therefore concludes that the web browser of Murray with displaying more than one Web pages/links/icons on a Web Browser (e.g., col. 4 lines 1-5, col. 5 lines 23-35) meaning of viewing (*sic*) a plurality of displays (Web pages/sites) displayed on a single screen still reads on the claim language.

Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion. As “means” are interpreted as to what structure is disclosed in the specification and their equivalents, and in view of the means in Figure 3, as well as the description of the invention and in view of the Japanese Patent Laid-Open Publications and Figure 1, one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret the “means” as a display screen or equivalent. In terms of claim 1, that would include plural, separate display screens, for example, a monochrome display screen, and a color display screen. As the

Examiner acknowledges that Murray only discloses use of one display, this display does not disclose or suggest the plural, separate display means as claimed in the present application. In addition, the web browser of Murray cited by the Examiner would also not disclose or teach plural, separate display means.

The Examiner newly argues that if Murray does not clearly teach that the terminal device is a portable terminal device having more than one physical display as claimed by the Applicants, that Sall clearly teaches multiple display screens of a laptop computer to provide more information to the user (citing col. 1 lines 50-61, and figs. 1, 4A-5B).

Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion also. In particular, Murray teaches the use markers, tool tips, etc. that are used to minimize the disruption of information on the displayed screen (see e.g., col. 9, lines 33-49; col. 10, lines 8-45). As such, Murray teaches away from the use of multiple screens.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 09/803,950

Attorney Docket No. Q63572

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald Kimble
Registration No. 44,186

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 18, 2006